

offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 154

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mrs. Kirkpatrick.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SPECIALIST DERRICK AMELI

(Ms. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Specialist Derrick Ameli, a member of the Minnesota National Guard from Savage, Minnesota.

Derrick was a husband, a brother, a friend and Guardsman whose service honored our community. Tragically, Derrick died by suicide last month, falling victim to the sometimes fatal disease of depression.

Like any ailment, no one is immune. Depression can and does take the very best of us. Addressing this epidemic is one of the Nation's most urgent challenges. But in order to combat this disease, we must first destigmatize mental health treatment.

In order to give our neighbors and our families the help they deserve, they need to feel safe and supported asking for treatment. We must begin treating mental health as the chronic illnesses they can be, for Derrick and for so many others who we have lost.

GOVERNING REQUIRES COMPROMISE

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Democrats won the House by the slimmest of margins in November. In fact, it is the slimmest Democrat majority since 1875, a mere five seats. 31,718 votes are what determines the majority. Their victory in the other branches was also tight, 50/50 on the Senate side.

Usually, when one party has a tiny majority, they recognize that governing requires compromise. Not this majority.

Less than 2 months into controlling the House, despite promising to solve problems and restore democracy, Democrats have proven that their primary goal is not governing but grievance, the politics of censorship, not common ground.

In January, they eliminated the motion to recommit, the last chance for the minority to improve legislation, without a single Republican vote. It will go down in history as the first time in the history of this body that a majority did that, deny the minority, the millions of constituents, their voice.

Already, millions have lost their voice in Congress due to the brazen partisanship. What Democrats are doing this week is even worse.

Today, they will hold a subcommittee hearing that will focus on broadcasters' and cable news' devotion to journalistic integrity. This explanation should concern every American.

It has never been Congress' role to define and enforce journalistic standards. The First Amendment expressly prohibits the government from controlling what the press says.

But Democrats are trying to give themselves the power to dictate what you can read and watch in your own home. And their assault on free speech goes beyond today's disgraceful hearing.

On Monday, Representatives ESHOO and MCNERNEY sent a letter to 12 cable, streaming, and satellite companies, essentially threatening them to remove "Fox News", "Newsmax", and "One America News Network" from their airways.

Here is just a quick snapshot of the answers they are demanding from the carriers:

"What moral or ethical principles do you apply in deciding which channels to carry or when to take adverse actions against a channel?"

"What steps did you take to monitor, respond to, and reduce the spread of disinformation, including encouragement or incitement of violence by channels your company disseminates to millions of Americans?"

Then the other question, coming from Congress in a majority of a committee: "Are you planning to continue to carry 'Fox News', 'Newsmax', 'One America News Network', both now and beyond any contract renewal date? If so, why?"

Now, I am not an attorney, but some people have asked me, does that reach an ethical complaint against these Members by using undue influence?

I don't know. I guess the Ethics Committee would have to decide that.

These are Members of Congress who are using their official position to coerce and control the information Americans can watch and access in their own homes. They are demanding more

censorship, more deplatforming, and more control of what Americans can watch.

In their letter, Congresswoman ESHOO and Congressman MCNERNEY suggest that censorship is necessary because conservative views are not only different, but they are dangerous. This is not only false; it is the same script used in countries like China to silence speech they disagree with.

Democrats would bring those same socialist standards to America, but those standards are dangerous, vague, and easily abused. They have no place here.

Democrats' action this week make it clear that the greatest threat to free speech today is not a law from Congress, which is bound by the First Amendment. The greatest threat is politicians who bully private companies to silence dissenting views.

The sad part is it isn't only Democrats who have done this. They sent a letter to a company of Amazon that was created to sell books, to tell them not to sell books.

Lastly, beyond these serious threats to free speech, the irony of Democrats' actions this week should not be lost on us. For the last 4 years, we were told that the greatest danger to free speech was President Trump.

To underscore this accusation, the liberal legacy newspaper in Washington adopted its first official slogan: "Democracy dies in darkness."

As usual, the heated rhetoric from the other side was off base—badly. The same party that is now worried about misinformation rumor mills and conspiracy theory hotbeds was comfortable with endorsing destructive and false narratives for 4 years.

Back in August, Congresswoman ESHOO herself basically alleged that the Trump administration was intentionally attacking the U.S. Postal Service. She called it election theft and a campaign of sabotage.

How about Congressman ADAM SCHIFF? For years, he said he had more than circumstantial evidence of Russian collusion. We all found that to be false. Nevertheless, networks like "MSNBC" continue to perpetuate the baseless accusation. I wonder if they sent a letter there.

Or how about our own Speaker PELOSI, who said in 2017, "Our election was hijacked. There is no question."

Mr. Speaker, the American people are capable of making decisions about how best to live their lives. They deserve to decide how to take care of their families or open their businesses during a pandemic. And they deserve to decide to watch the news, judge the information they choose, and draw their own conclusions about its accuracy. They need us to trust them, not to try to control them.

If Democrats accepted robust debate, they would find that more people would trust Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this is a body that is using its power to try to determine